



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,285

03/26/2004

Tae-jung Lee

SAM-0318DIV

9261

7590

06/29/2005

Mills & Onello LLP
Suite 605
Eleven Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

EXAMINER

LUU, CHUONG A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2818

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,285

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Chuong A. Luu

Art Unit

2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Statutory Basis

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The Rejections

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter APA) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. 6,383,920 B1).

APA discloses a semiconductor device with

(1); (9) a substrate (3) which includes a base layer (10), a buried oxide layer (15), and a semiconductor layer (20);

an isolation layer which is formed in a trench that defines an active region on the semiconductor layer (20) (see page 3, lines 15-18),

wherein the trench comprises a first region (B) having a depth less than the

Art Unit: 2818

thickness of the semiconductor layer (20) and a second region (C) having a depth as much as the thickness of the semiconductor layer (20) (see Figures 2A-2B), and wherein the isolation layer (70) includes an oxide layer (32) and a nitride liner (60) that are sequentially formed along the surface of the trench and a dielectric layer (65) that fills the trench (see Figures 2A-2E);

(7) further comprising a transistor (80) formed in the active region (A) (see Figure 1);

APA does not explicitly disclose the depth of the first region is less than the depth of the second region by 200 to 1500Å; the oxide layer is thicker in the first region than in the second region by 1 to 50 nm; the thickness of the oxide layer in the second region is in the range of 3 to 30 nm; the thickness of the nitride liner is in the range of 3 to 20 nm; and wherein the oxide liner is formed by chemical vapor deposition (CVD). However, Wang discloses a dual damascene structure with (1)..... wherein the oxide layer is thicker in the first region than second region (see Figures 4A-4F); (10) wherein the oxide liner is formed by chemical vapor deposition (CVD) (see column 11, lines 13-15). In additional, the depth of the first region is less than the depth of the second region by 200 to 1500Å; the oxide layer is thicker in the first region than in the second region by 1 to 50 nm; the thickness of the oxide layer in the second region is in the range of 3 to 30 nm; the thickness of the nitride liner is in the range of 3 to 20 nm being within the range is considered to be obvious. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify and select the specific material for isolation layers as in the semiconductor device of the APA's device

Art Unit: 2818

(accordance with the teaching of Wang) by applying depth of the first region is less than the depth of the second region; the oxide layer is thicker in the first region than in the second region; the thickness of the oxide layer in the second region is; the thickness of the nitride liner and wherein the oxide liner is formed by chemical vapor deposition (CVD) within the range as claimed for the purpose of providing for reduced power consumption and increase operational speed, and it also has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art and it is noted that the applicant does not disclose criticality in the ranges claimed. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (see MPEP j 2144.05).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2818

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuong A. Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1902. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:15-2:45).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David C. Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAL
June 21, 2005


David Nelms
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800